

filing a divisional application.

MPEP §803 sets forth the criteria for restriction between patentably distinct inventions. (A) indicates that the inventions must be independent (see MPEP §802.01, §806.04, §808.01) or distinct as claimed (see MPEP §806.05-806.05(i)); and (B) indicates that there must be a serious burden on the Examiner if restriction is required (see MPEP §803.02, §806.04(a)- §806.04(i), §808.01(a) and §808.02). The Examiner has not set forth why there would be a serious burden if restriction is required.

III. Conclusion

Upon review of references involved in this field of technology, when considering that the apparatus recited by the Species II-V claims are directed to an optical pickup device having a chromatic aberration correction lens comprising a first lens having a positive power and a second lens having a negative power, and elected claims 1-3, 5-6, 11-15, 19-21 and 25-42 are directed to Species I, and when all of the other various facts are taken into consideration, it is believed that upon reconsideration of the Examiner's initial restriction requirement, all of the pending claims should be examined in the subject application.

In view of the foregoing amendments, arguments and remarks, all claims are deemed to be allowable and this application is believed to be in condition for allowance.

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our deposit account number 19-3935.

Should any questions remain unresolved, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicants' attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 11-10-03

By: 

Michael J. Badagliacca  
Registration No. 39,099

700 11th Street, N.W., Ste. 500  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
(202) 434-1500